DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 451 754 HE 033 881

AUTHOR Gaffney, Maureen A.
TITLE Post Tenure Socialization: How Female & Male Faculty Experience Promotion to Full Professor. ASHE Annual Meeting Paper.
PUB DATE 2001-11-18
NOTE 32p.; Written with Edward S. Lubimescu, Damitry Suspitsin, Sara Terheggen, Xing Zhou, and Carol Colbeck. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education (ASHE) (25th, Sacramento, CA, November 16-19, 2000).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Faculty; *Faculty Promotion; Females; Higher Education; *Sex Differences; Socialization; *Tenure

ABSTRACT

This paper outlines a proposed study of the academic promotion process by obtaining the faculty perception of the process through descriptions of their experiences. The primary area of concern is the promotion of female associate professors to the status of full professor. The conceptual framework of the study is predicated on four bodies of literature: (1) values, beliefs, and attitudes as determinants of social behavior and change; (2) the process of organizational socialization and its tactics; (3) the conception of a bureaucratic form of authority; and (4) a critique of the bureaucratic organization as a gender-neutral environment. A basic conceptual framework was developed that included organizational culture, individual characteristics, and the promotion process. The promotion process will be studied at three Research I universities drawn from Big Ten institutions. Within the three institutions, researchers will interview faculty members from three disciplines with varying gender representations: engineering, education, and business. The total sample will consist of 48 faculty members who had been reviewed for full professorship within the last 2 years. (Contains 20 references:) (SLD)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 451 754

Maureen A. Gaffney

Graduate Student and Research Assistant
Penn State University
Department of Higher Education
115 Charlotte Building
State College PA 16801

814 - 863-2690

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M. Gaffney

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

HE035881

## Introduction

Advancing in rank to full professor in a research university is a form of recognition bestowed on individuals that signifies their professional contribution to a body of certified knowledge (Long, Allison, & McGinnis, 1993). It can be described as the final rite of passage to higher organizational status within the university cultur (Tierney, 1996). Despite a large body of literature that describes the experiences of new faculty in the tenure process, little research has been done to substantiate what constitutes the essential structure of the promotion process to full professor from the perspective of the faculty member who have obtained and/or been denied full professorship. Although the process is described from an organizational perspective as similar to the tenure process, there is a perception among faculty that the requirements for promotion to full professor are more stringent.

## Problem

The organizational culture of a research university is complex, and individuals interpret the culture in different ways. The promotion process is described from an organization's perspective in its faculty handbooks. There are also many published guides on the market that are available to ease the stress of the process. The books often take faculty step-by-step through the requirements, providing checklists of issues that one needs to address. There are a vast number of materials needed upon a review for promotion and tenure. The supporting materials typically demonstrate the level of involvement in and contributions to teaching, research, and service. Most institutions require a faculty member demonstrate productivity in all three areas (Whicker, Kronenfeld, & Strickland, 1993).

Research, teaching, and service are key components in the promotion and tenure process. Each institution has policies requiring which areas are emphasized and what documentation is suggested for a solid dossier. Sufficient evidence must be provided in order for the faculty member to prove their efforts. Research or scholarship is often the most explained component in the promotion and tenure policies issued by an institution (Whicker et al, 1993). The criteria are typically based on the following evidence: peer-reviewed publications, books, scholarly presentations, positive reviews of publications, citations for publications, and grants for research (Whicker et al, 1993). Teaching evidence can include but is not limited to student evaluations, peer observations of classroom teaching, letters from former students, success of graduate students, and teaching awards (Whicker et al, 1993). Service is a component that is difficult to define but evidence can include professional associations, editorial boards or journals, review activities, committee participation, community talks, and faculty advisory roles (Whicker et al, 1993).

An objective study of these empirical indicators of the promotion process requires not only the organization's perspective, but also a description of the faculty's experiences from their perspective. To describe the promotion process as indicated only by the organization's description may not be congruent with the faculty perspective. Defining the process from the faculty perspective helps other faculty as well as the organization understand the individual experience of the promotion process, and components that may help or hinder the process and ultimately impact the final decision.

The purpose of this study is to research the phenomenon of the promotion process by obtaining the faculty perception of the process through verbal descriptions of their

experiences. Our primary area of concern is the promotion of women associate professors to the status of a full professor. This component of the promotion and tenure process is highly under-researched indicating a clear gap in the area of research. If we can examine the experiences of both male and female associate professors, we can begin to understand the institutional and individual implications for this population in the academy. The essential structure of the promotion process will be extracted from these descriptions by phenomenological analysis.

In attempting to explore the current issue, it is important to ascertain the conditions and viewpoints that inform the study. Social scientists of organization theory, especially those writing from a gender perspective, point out several factors impeding the advancement of women in academic institutions. The obvious discriminatory practices include unequal pay and sex segregation of work (Acker, 1990). An examination of the organizational environment reveals barriers to women's full socialization into the academic culture (Menges & Exum, 1983). An obvious inequity appears in an examination of tenure and salary rates. In 1995, 39 percent of full-time females were tenured as compared to 59 percent of men (Schneider, 1998). Even this figure only brought the number of women holding full professorships to 18 percent (Schneider, 1998). In addition, women earned less than their male counterparts in 1995 across all ranks (Schneider, 1998). Some argue the reasons for the low numbers are not found within the hiring practices but rather reflect the year in which the person was hired. They are claiming the statistics are skewed because those who were hired have not had ample opportunity to go through the process (McElrath, 1992).

Women faculty are often subjected to increased advising responsibilities (Garcia, 1979), increased teaching loads, and more demanding committee assignments (Bellas & Toutkoushian, 1999). To contribute to these problems, women are often isolated from a solid network of peers who can provide them with vital professional information. Long, Allison, and McGinnis (1993) attribute their finding that rates of promotion are lower for women than men for promotion to both associate and full professor to the explanation that women are expected to meet higher standards. Along with these visible obstacles, there are a number of subtle forms of discrimination such as covert sexual harassment, sexist stereotyping of women's roles, and the masculine orientation of organizational structures.

Early organizational theorists emphasized the division of labor, rationality, efficiency of operation achieved by hierarchies and management by rules and regulations, and separation of the public and public spheres in organizations. Max Weber's (1947/1996) concept of rational bureaucracy and Frederick Taylor's (1911) emphasis on scientific management are among the most influential representations of early organizational thought. These theories were perceived as objective and gender neutral.

In order to examine whether inequity exists for a tenured woman associate professor, it is important to begin to perceive gender as an essential component of the institutional structure. As Acker (1990) observed, gender segregation of work and income and status inequality between women and men are in part created in organizational processes. Dissecting these processes will contribute to the understanding of what characteristics contribute to success in the tenure decision and how gender is incorporated as a factor within these characteristics.

To examine the academic world for women without relating the other side of the spectrum is a disservice. Although this aspect of academia is often overlooked, it is important to include in an effort to understand the difficulties that both genders experience as they seek full professorship. Male associate professors have experienced gender discrimination as well. In one case, a philosopher at Kutztown University of Pennsylvania accused the university of gender discrimination because they did not hire him for a subsequent tenure-track post (Basinger, 1998). He was denied this position even after the department recommended that he be hired. In another case at Saint Bonaventure University, eleven men filed gender discrimination complaints after being fired by the president. Due to budget crisis, the president let twenty-two faculty go, all were men. The president asserted, "it would have been unconscionable to let the number of women drop further" (Chronicle, 1994). Although these cases are concerned with issues of hiring practices, the cases should not discount the potential gender discrimination faced by male faculty members. In this study, by incorporating the male perspective into the methodology, we hope to get a more complete sense of the issues facing women and men, and how the organizational culture and structure play roles in their perceptions.

## Significance of Study

Promotion to full professorship is one of the principal academic incentives and rewards to faculty who have made exceptional contributions within academe. Inequitable policies and practices can result in poor use of human resources, individual frustration, low faculty morale, and low institutional productivity. Our research intends to fill the gap in the previous empirical studies: what are the factors that privilege or hinder a faculty

member to be promoted to full professor? Are women are more likely to be stuck as career associate professors? We are confident that the findings of this research will inform the debate regarding the tripartite missions of the university and the fairness of different promotion criteria across disciplines. They will also provide valuable information for universities, colleges and departments to build up a fair and effective promotion practices and to improve their faculty development program.

## Theoretical Perspectives

The conceptual framework of the study is predicated on four bodies of literature, including values, beliefs, and attitudes as determinants of social behavior and change (Rokeach, 1975), the process of organizational socialization and its tactics (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979), the conception of a bureaucratic form of authority (Weber, 1946/1996), and Martin and Knopoff's (1997) critique of the Weberian bureaucratic organization as a gender-neutral environment.

### Values, Attitudes and Beliefs

According to Rokeach (1975), an individual's beliefs, attitudes and values are functionally integrated in a system that produces behavioral change. This integration presupposes an internal consistency that not only determines behavior, but also is responsible for the dynamic of change. If one area is affected, the other areas will be affected as well. Among the three components, value is described as having a central role because of its strong motivational function, as well as the role it plays in determining attitude and behavior. Defined as standards or criteria for guiding action, values influence not only an individual's behavior but can also be used to influence the values, attitudes and behaviors of others. Rokeach (1975) concludes that focusing on the

centrality of values will extend our understanding of the more complicated effects of socialization.

A further elaboration is in the operational concept of a value system that arranges values hierarchically and in order of importance (Rokeach, 1975). Choices between conflicting values will be resolved by the value system, by the learned organization for making choices. Individual variations in value are also moderated by cultural, institutional and social factors. Theories related to consistency and dissonance of values help to explain the dynamics involved in making changes in an individual's value system (Rokeach, 1975).

Socialization of faculty implies a process of learning the values, attitudes and beliefs of the new organizational culture (Tierney & Bensimon, 1996). This necessary education and reeducation is similar to the processes described by Rokeach (1975). Consistency and dissonance will need to be addressed as the individual moves through the socialization processes leading to promotion. Therefore, individual and professional value systems have the potential to impact in a significant way on the promotion process for faculty.

## Organizational Socialization

Organizational socialization is the process by which an individual acquires the social knowledge and skills necessary to assume an organizational role (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979). Given a particular role, organizational socialization refers to the fashion in which an individual is taught and learns what behavior and perspectives are customary and desirable within the working setting as well as what are not. Since learning itself is a continuous and life-long process, the entire organizational career of an individual can be

characterized as a socialization process. A faculty, especially a new faculty, is taught and learns the long-standing policies and rules, the desired behavior of the faculty (teaching, research and service), shared criteria for promotion and tenure, the normative values held by the majority, matter-of-fact prejudices, and certain customs and rituals suggestive of how faculty are related to each other. As Van Maanen and Schein (1979) put it, "since such a process of socialization necessarily involves the transmission of information and values, it is fundamentally a culture matter" (p. 235). Each university has its own culture, and the tenure and promotion are the important subunits of its overall culture and the strongest example of a socializing mechanism (Tierney & Bensimon, 1996).

From beginning to end, a person's career within an organization represents a potential series of transitions from one position to another (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979; Schein, 1971). It is most obvious when a person first enters the organization and undergoes the transition from an outsider to an insider. It is perhaps least obvious when an experienced member of an organization undergoes a simple change of assignment, shift, or job location (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979). Nevertheless, a period of socialization accompanies each passage.

Schein (1971) has developed a three-dimensional model of the organization, which provides insight into the role transition of an individual. The first dimension is a functional one, which refers to the various tasks performed by members of an organization. At universities, the academic section can be regarded as the functional dimension because it carries out the major missions of a university, teaching, research and service. And this dimension can be segregated into relatively distinct functional divisions: colleges, departments, and programs with the faculty being the functional

agents who carry out those missions. The hierarchical dimension refers to the hierarchical distribution of ranks within the organization. At universities, one of the reflections of the hierarchical dimension is the hierarchy of faculty members' professional ranks from instructor to full professor.

The third interactional dimension refers to a person's inclusion within the organization. "It can be depicted as if it were a radial dimension extending from the membership edge of a slice of organizational members in toward the middle of the functional circle" (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979, p. 221). As a member's relationship with others in some segment of the organization changes, he or she moves toward the "center" or away toward the "periphery." "This radial dimension must involve the social rules, norms, and values through which a person's worthiness to a group is judged by members of that group" (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979, p. 222).

Given a particular function and hierarchical level, passing along the inclusionary dimension can be characterized as going from an outsider to a marginally accepted novice group member, to a confederate of sorts who assists other members on certain selected matters, to a confidant or intimate of others who fully shares in all the social, cultural, and task-related affairs of the group (Schein, 1971). At universities, the newly employed instructors or assistant professors are at the "periphery" of this dimension. As they are gradually socialized, they move toward the center. The granting of university tenure represents the formal recognition of crossing a major inclusionary boundary, as well as the more obvious hierarchical passage.

However, the socialization process does not stop at the time of the tenure or promotion decision. Since faculty member's identity or position changes, a new kind of

socialization process begins, that is the socialization from associate professor to full professor. Previous empirical studies only pay attention to the tenure socialization process while assuming that faculty are fully socialized after they have gone through the tenure and promotion to associate professor. On the contrary, our assumption is that the socialization process continues in a new and different way. Their success or failure in this new socialization hinders their chances to be promoted to the center of the academic dimension of the university. The purpose of this research is to study the socialization process of faculty after they cross the boundaries of tenure and promotion to the associate professors.

Van Maannen and Schein (1979) point out that organizational socialization and the learning associated with it do not occur in a social vacuum strictly on the basis of the official and available versions of the new role requirements. Colleagues, superiors, subordinates, clients, and other associates support and guide the individual in learning the new model. They provide the individual with a sense of accomplishment and competence. Our assumption is that male and female faculty encounter different socialization processes above the associate professor level. Organizational cultures, hierarchical structures, male dominated environment, individual scholarship and personal characteristics influence men and women faculty in different ways, some hinder while other privilege their socialization and promotion to full professor (Long, Allison, McGinnis, 1993).

## Weber's Conception of a Bureaucratic Form of Authority

One of Weber's (1946/1996) types of authority is the rational-legal authority inherent in a bureaucratic organizational form. A bureaucracy is described as rational

because this organizational form has a carefully designed structure that coordinates the activities of the members in the interests of the organization's goals (Pugh & Hickson, 1997). The legal component of the definition refers to the mode of exercising authority through a system of rules and regulations. In a bureaucracy, rights and responsibilities within the organization are attached to the office an employee occupies, not to the holder of the office. Weber argues that the larger and more complex a formal organization becomes, the greater is the need for a chain of command to coordinate the activities of its members (Scott, 1998). This need is fulfilled by a hierarchical authority structure that operates under explicit rules and procedures.

Weber (1946/1996) distinguishes six principal characteristics of a bureaucracy: a clear-cut division of labor among various officials; a hierarchy of authority with explicit descriptions of the responsibilities of each office; an elaborate system of rules and regulations governing the functioning of an organization; separation of the private sphere of life from the official duties; a demand for expert training of employees; and the need for the full working capacity of the official.

Weber argues that an organization with the aforementioned characteristics would be highly efficient in coordinating its members' job performances and achieving specific objectives (Scott, 1998). As an ideal type, his analysis presupposes an abstract organizational form with ideal descriptions of the officials' duties that transcended gender and personality. Recently, some scholars (Acker, 1990; Martin & Knopoff, 1997), especially those writing from a feminist perspective, have begun to question the alleged gender neutrality of a bureaucratic organizational form.

Martin and Knopoff's Critique of the Bureaucratic Form of Organization

In the analysis of Weber's conception of bureaucracy, Martin and Knopoff (1997) challenge some of the fundamental assumptions of bureaucratic organizations. Using the method of deconstruction, they uncover the gender implications of Weber's allegedly gender-neutral characteristics of bureaucracy, including division of labor, fixed hierarchy of authority, impersonal management of the office by rules, demand of full working capacity of employees, need for expert training, and management based on written documents.

The scholars' basic premise is that bureaucracy is gender biased because its characteristics are modeled after a male worker. They make a list of qualities implicitly operating in a bureaucratic model and observe that these qualities are dichotomies one side of which is always valued more than the other. Moreover, the two sides of the dichotomies are gendered: the left side is more likely to be associated with male/masculine and public spheres of life while the right side is typically associated with female/feminine and private spheres; the more valued dichotomous traits are well suited to the stereotypical description of men. Following are several of these dichotomies: objective-subjective, rational-irrational, expert-untrained, dehumanized-humane, detached-involved, impersonal-personal, unemotional-emotional, authoritarian-nurturant, and unequal-egalitarian. In sum, Martin and Knopoff (1997) believe that the set of values underlying the structure of contemporary organizations devalues and excludes women's experiences by imposing perspectives and practices biased in favor of men.

## Concepts

Informed by the above theories, we construct a basic conceptual framework as including three major areas: Organizational Culture, Individual Characteristics, and the Promotion Process. It is hypothesized that within a particular institutional context, a relationship exists between the organizational culture and the individual characteristics of the faculty members, and that this relationship affects the promotion process in a yet undetermined way. The Organizational Culture area contains four constructs. The first three, hierarchy of authority, impersonal rule by rules, and the full working capacity of the official are selected from Weber's theory of bureaucracy. Another major block of constructs pertains to the socialization of the faculty. Informed by the work of Van Mannean and Schein (1979), we limit our consideration to four dichotomous tactics of socialization: collective versus individual, formal versus informal, fixed versus variable, and investiture versus divestiture. A final cluster of constructs is titled Individual Characteristics. It includes six variables: time in rank, productivity as defined by teaching and research activities, training and sponsorship, gender, family responsibilities and individual values and beliefs. Our hypothesis is that, the organizational culture and individual characteristics influence each other, and both of them impact on the socialization of tenured associate professors, on their perspectives on promotion, and the actual promotion processes they have undergone which lead to either promotion granted or promotion denied.

## Individual Characteristics

The primary focus of the promotion process is the individual scholar and their contributions. Decisions are generally based on the evaluation of activities within the

three core functions of the university, teaching ability and effectiveness, research or creative accomplishment and scholarship and service to the university, the public, and the profession. Each scholar is perceived as unique, with the intention to contribute in a significant way to the application or creation of a certifiable body of knowledge. Long, Allison, and McGinnis (1993) claim that previous studies on promotion and tenure have been limited to solitary considerations either of an individual characteristic or of combined considerations that include two or three variables. The characteristics most often mentioned are gender, discipline, productivity, training and sponsorship, institutional location, time in rank and family responsibilities. Few studies have attempted to combine or control for all of the characteristics currently identified in the literature (Long, Allison, & McGinnis, 1993). In this study, individual characteristics are defined as time in rank, teaching and research productivity, training and scholarship, gender, family responsibilities and individual values and beliefs. Including these characteristics will create an opportunity to provide a more accurate assessment of their individual and combined effects.

Time in Rank

Time in rank refers to the length of time an individual spends in one rank before being promoted to another. Moving expeditiously from the associate level to full professor confers a certain prestige on the individual, and is considered a critical component of successful promotion (Long et al., 1993). Delays or time outs in the process appear to have a negative or positive effect depending on gender (Long et al., 1993).

Productivity

Productivity is traditionally defined as the product of scholarly effort that can be measured by the number of publications and the number of citations to those publications. Unfortunately, few studies examine both aspects of productivity in their assessment. Several studies that have included productivity, either as the number of publications or the number of citations as a measure of promotion have concluded that the higher the level of productivity, the more likely the candidate for promotion will be successful (Hargens & Far, 1973 as cited in Long et al, 1993). This is not a universal finding however. Cole and Cole (1979, pp.131-32 as cited in Long, et al., 1993) describe the correlation between promotion and productivity as a more significant event in distinguished departments compared to a lesser effect in less distinguished departments. Long, Allison and McGinnis (1993) found that in research universities "promotion was most strongly determined by the number of articles published while in rank" (p.713).

The definition of productivity can also be extended to include a quantitative measure, teaching loads, and qualitative measure, teaching effectiveness. It has been argued that the impact of teaching skills and abilities on promotion varies according to discipline, gender, and institution (Long et al., 1993; Tierney & Bensimon, 1996). Achieving promotion implies that the individual faculty member was able to properly balance effort and emphasis in the areas of scholarly and teaching productivity.

Training and Sponsorship

Training and sponsorship are defined as the education and professional mentoring of the individual seeking promotion. It is unclear if degrees from prestigious departments or institutions have a positive effect on the outcome of promotion (Long et al., 1993).

Mentoring can be viewed as an extension of the organizational socialization process (Tierney & Bensimon, 1996). Tierney and Bensimon (1996) suggest that mentoring can be both formal and informal and can cross disciplinary lines. Senior faculty members have multiple roles as mentors, contributing to both the research agendas and the professional development of the faculty seeking promotion. Since the promotion process to full professor is described as a process that requires higher levels of professional scrutiny, effective mentoring would appear to provide an opportunity for the exchange of information and clarification of goals through professional advice and expertise.

Gender

Gender has been proposed as a significant variable in the initial promotion and tenure process. The issue of promotion to senior ranks has not been examined extensively. Long, Allison and McGinnis (1993) examined promotion activities in research universities, concentrating on sex differences and productivity. They concluded: " All else being equal, women are promoted more slowly" (p.720). They reinforce this conclusion by stating:

> At the assistant level, the time frame favors men, at the rank of associate professor women pay a greater price for being in prestigious departments, and while they receive a greater return for each publication, this provides an advantage only for the published female scientists (p.720).

Males have also claimed a type of reverse discrimination, claiming that they have lost promotions because of the equity issues of the department or institution (Basinger, 1998; Chronicle, 1994). Gender has also been introduced into conversations regarding the type of committee and service assignments, course load, and the nature of the student and parent relationships expected of faculty seeking tenure and promotion (Tierney &

Bensimon, 1996). Understanding the positive or negative impact of gender as perceived by the faculty can facilitate the development of effective socialization processes.

Family Responsibilities

Faculty face demands of personal responsibilities generated by their families. The effect that these obligations have on promotion is not clear. Several researchers have concluded that marriage and family do impact the promotion process in a negative way for women, particularly when it requires leaves of absence. Another study reports that the presence of children and career interruption did not account for sex differences in rank (McElrath, 1992).

Individual Values and Beliefs

A significant filter of the socialization process in the academic community is the individual. The most celebrated and discussed socialization process for faculty is tenure and promotion. Tierney and Bensimon (1996) have described tenure as "a ritualized process that involves the transmission of the organizational culture. Tenure is the strongest example of a socializing mechanism for new faculty in that it involves the exchange and definition of thought and action" (pp. 36-37). Promotion to full professor can be conceived as a discrete extension of the socialization process that signifies a significant level of prestige within the organizational culture. The process implies that two value systems, that of the individual and the organization, have resolved issues of dissonance and consistency (Rokeach, 1975).

Although the process can be acknowledged as having a functional end, the individual is granted or denied promotion, certain questions remain. How are the effects of the socialization process perceived by the individual, and what occurs within the

process that helps or hinders the individual in the quest for promotion? The lived experiences of the individual contribute to the decisions to maintain or change the hierarchical arrangements of the value systems. The query can be extended to the organizational culture. Does the socialization process produce a reciprocal change or effect within the organizational value system? The promotion process and its effects can be better understood through the perceptions of individuals as they experience the activities and relationships through the lens of their personal value systems.

## Organizational Culture

### The Tactics of Organizational Socialization

Tactics of organizational socialization refers to the ways in which the experiences of individuals in transition from one role to another are structured for them by others in an organization (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979). There are various forms and results of socialization as they occur when persons move across hierarchical, functional, and inclusionary boundaries. Van Maanen and Schein (1979) have identified at least six major tactical dimensions that characterize the structural side of organizational socialization:

1. Collective vs. individual socialization processes
2. Formal vs. informal socialization processes
3. Sequential vs. random steps in socialization processes
4. Fixed vs. variable socialization processes
5. Serial vs. disjunctive socialization processes
6. Investiture vs. divestiture socialization processes

Van Maanen and Schein (1979) observe, "the relative use of a particular tactic upon persons crossing given organizational boundaries can be, by and large, a choice made by organizational decision makers on functional, economic, technical, humanistic, expedient, traditional, or perhaps purely arbitrary grounds" (p. 232). All these tactics may be used by the universities. Because of the unique academic atmosphere of the university, our assumption is that the university in general applies the collective vs. individual, formal vs. informal, fix vs. variable, and investiture vs. divestiture socialization processes. This gives rise to two questions: do the universities, or colleges, or departments, use different tactics with male and female faculty? Do the same tactics affect male and female faculty in the same way?

Collective vs. individual socialization processes. Collective socialization refers to the tactic of taking a group of recruits who are facing a given boundary passage and putting them through a common set of experiences together. New faculty may experience collective socialization if there are significant numbers of them working in a culture that is cohesive and unitary (Tierney & Bensimon, 1996). Individual socialization refers to the tactic of processing recruits singly and in isolation from one another through a more or less unique set of experiences. Individual socialization precedes passage through the innermost inclusionary boundaries within an organizational segment. To be granted full professorship or a very central position in any organizational segment implies that the individual has been evaluated by others on the scene as to his or her trustworthiness and readiness to defend the common interests of other insiders. Such delicate evaluations can only be accomplished on a relatively personal and case-by-case basis. Although male and

female faculty go through the same collective socialization, the person who gets more individual socialization will get more chances to be promoted.

Formal vs. informal socialization processes. Formal socialization refers to those processes in which a newcomer is more or less segregated from regular organizational members while being put through a set of experiences tailored explicitly for the newcomer. Informal socialization processes, by contrast, do not distinguish the newcomer's role specifically, nor is there an effort made in such programs to rigidly differentiate the recruits from the other more experienced organizational members. They provide a sort of laissez-faire socialization for recruits whereby new roles are learned through trial and error. Informal socialization is largely determined by the relevant knowledge possessed by an agent and, of course, the agent's ability to transfer such knowledge. Sometimes they have to force others in the setting to teach them. In the informal socialization, when female faculty learn through trial and error, they tend to encounter more discrimination and suspicion from other faculty, which has a negative impacts on their socialization process. Male faculty, however, are likely to get more encouragement and support from the external environment, which is male-dominated in general (Acker, 1990).

Fixed vs. variable socialization processes. Fixed socialization processes provide a recruit with the precise knowledge of the time it will take to complete a give passage. Tenure and promotion to associate professorship come along a fixed timetable, so it can be regarded as a fixed socialization process. Variable socialization processes give a recruit few clues as to when to expect a given boundary passage, such as the promotion to full professorship. As Van Maanen and Shein (1979) state, "variable socialization

processes keep a recruit maximally off balance and at the mercy of socialization agents" (p. 246). Variable processes are likely to create much anxiety and perhaps frustration for the faculty who are unable to construct reasonably valid timetables to inform them of the appropriateness of their promotion (or lack of promotion) in the universities. This can also explain why some of them quit the job since they perceive no chance for them to be promoted.

Investiture vs. divestiture socialization processes. Investiture socialization processes ratify and document for recruits the viability and usefulness of those personal characteristics they bring with them to the organization. Divestiture socialization processes seek to deny and strip away certain personal characteristics of a recruit. Universities recruit new faculty or promote them to full professor because of their contributions in their fields and because of their individual characteristics. However, all the promotion policies strip away, or try to avoid, the differences between male and female faculty and the differences among the individuals. They neglect that some people are good at teaching while others are good at research. And the current promotion policies in most research universities give more weights to research rather than teaching – the "publish or perish" model. However, in promotional practices, gender issues play an important role in the promotion decision.

As different universities apply different socialization tactics, they socialize and influence male and female faculty in a different way. Van Maanen and Schein (1979) conclude: "Organizational results are not simply the consequences of the work accomplished by people brought into the organization, rather, they are the consequences

of the work these people accomplish after the organization itself has completed its work on them" (p. 255).

Hierarchy of Authority

In every bureaucratic organization, there is a hierarchy of authority—"a firmly ordered system of super- and subordination in which there is a supervision of the lower offices by the higher ones" (Weber, 1946/1996, p. 80). A typical hierarchy takes the shape of a pyramid, with greater authority for the few at the top and less for the many at the bottom. The scope of each office's responsibilities is clearly defined by an organization's rules and regulations. Because the rights and responsibilities belong not to the holder of the office, but to the office itself, they are implicitly perceived as objective and gender neutral.

Weber maintains that the hierarchical structure is needed in complex organizations to ensure greater control and reliability of the individuals' activities. A set of graded levels of authority insures close supervision of lower–level offices by those at the top, on the one hand, and provides a clear-cut path of appeal in case of grievances, on the other. As Scott (1998) puts it:

> The behavior of subordinates is rendered more reliable by the specificity of their role obligations, the clarity of hierarchical connections, and their continuing dependence on the hierarchy in the short run for income and in the longer term for career progression. And superiors are prevented from behaving arbitrarily or capriciously in their demands made on subordinates (p. 47).

While Weber and other organizational theorists consider organizational hierarchy as an objective mechanism of achieving greater coherence and stability in the functioning

of the organization, feminist scholars view it as a structural element that hinders promotion of women in corporate business and at colleges and universities. For example, Martin and Knopoff (1997) maintain that hierarchy works against the idea of democracy: It promotes inequality by reinforcing the status of bureaucratic officials, who are typically drawn from the most affluent, male segment of the population. This study is aimed at ascertaining the effect of organizational hierarchy on the promotion chances of male and female academics.

Impersonal Rule by Rules

Typically, an elaborate system of rules and procedures governs the day-to-day functioning of a bureaucracy. Organizational decisions are based on abstract rules and on established procedures, which are often recorded in written files. The existence of rules and regulations insures a smooth operation of organizations and provides more effective and efficient administration.

An important attribute of a system of organizational rules is its abstract, impersonal character. Impersonal rule by rules in a bureaucracy, as Weber (1946/1996) contends, ensures objectivity and detachment--a mode of decision making designed to control subjective emotional relationships, capable of standing in the way of business, between and among employees. However, Martin and Knopoff (1997) argue that it is impossible to be completely impersonal and detached while interacting with people: a person's very presence affects what happens in an interaction. Moreover, the scholars note that impersonal authority by abstract rules is suited more to men's style of decision making and lends itself better to the masculine value system because the expression of

emotions and caring is typically associated with women. As Martin and Knopoff (1997) observe,

> The norms associated with impersonality devalue aspects of life that are central to the feminine stereotype: subjective, humane, emotional, involved, sympathetic, graceful, moved by gratitude, egalitarian, nurturant, and so on. To the extent that a person wants to embody these supposedly feminine qualities (and many women and some men do), functioning effectively in a high-status bureaucratic position may be difficult (pp. 45-46).

Demand for Full Working Capacity of Officials

Another important characteristic of a bureaucracy in Weber's scheme is the demand for full commitment to work on the part of employees. As Weber (1946/1996) puts it, "when the office is fully developed, official activity demands the full working capacity of the official, irrespective of the fact that his obligatory time in the bureau may be firmly delimited" (p. 81). Employees are expected to view their jobs as what Weber calls a "vocation," and their ultimate goal is to attain tenure of position that will protect them from arbitrary decisions by the administration. This full commitment on the part of employees will bind them to their organizations and, by pressing them to spend more time at work, will reduce the individuals' commitment to other, more personal imperatives. The overall effect, in Weber's view, will be greater effectiveness and efficiency of the functioning of the organization.

Martin and Knopoff (1997) point out that the dichotomy of private versus public spheres is a false distinction. They argue that these two spheres of life mutually reinforce each other: What happens at work greatly affects personal matters and the domestic

environment, and visa versa. To Martin and Knopoff (1996), full-time commitment to a career is a gendered requirement because it has a direct impact on family life, "placing a disproportionate burden on women, particularly if they have children" (p. 45). The scholars conclude that because women are more involved in the housework and child care and thus are able to dedicate less time to their careers than men are capable of, they often find themselves at a disadvantage in organizations in which they work. The extent to which the requirement of full-time commitment to work affects the processes of promotion and tenure of both men and women will be the subject of this investigation.

## Methodology

Our study will investigate the candidate's perceptions of the promotion process from associate to full professor. Although many scholars have investigated socialization of new faculty, there is limited research and literature exploring this aspect. Our goal is to understand this phenomenon through the standpoint of the faculty members who have recently been reviewed for promotion. We are particularly interested in exploring how, if at all, gender influences faculty experience of socialization to full professorship. Through phenomenological analysis, we will explore the following two questions:

1. From the perspective of faculty members seeking promotion to full professor in a research university, what is the structure of the promotion process?
2. How do faculty describe the process of socialization they experienced when seeking promotion to full professor in a research university?
3. How, if at all, does process of socialization vary from men to women and/or do the socialization processes differ by department?

## Sample Population

### Institution and Discipline Sample

To control for institutional type, our study will be restricted to faculty at Research I institutions according to the Carnegie Classification. We are choosing Research I universities because of their stronger emphasis on research in the promotion process. We will choose three Research I universities drawn from the Big Ten institutions. Within these two institutions, we will interview from three disciplines with varying degrees of gender representation. Engineering was chosen for its lowest percentage of women faculty, education for its equal and highest representation of women, and business as a discipline with gender representation falling between that of engineering and education. According to 1992 data of full-time faculty members, 5.9 percent of engineering faculty were women out of 24, 680; 50.1 percent out of 36,851 were women in education, and 30.1 percent out of 39,848 were women in business (Chronicle Almanac, 1999). By choosing to control for discipline, we will explore how gender representation differences affect female and male association professors' experiences of their departmental cultures and socialization processes.

### Faculty Sample

Our total sample will consist of forty-eight faculty members who were reviewed for full professorship within the last two years. We will interview four faculty members from two perspectives of the process. The two perspectives that would be chosen are 1) those faculty members who have been granted promotion to full professor, and 2) those faculty members who have went up but been denied promotion to full professor. From our institutional sample, we will select four women and four men for each perspective

level described above within each discipline chosen. We are interested in observing the differences in perceptions of men and women presiding within the disciplines.

## Data Collection and Analysis

We will develop a standardized protocol from which we will conduct our interviews with each faculty member. The questions will be open-ended in order to elicit information about how faculty members perceive their experiences. Some examples of the questions include: 1) How would you describe the structure of the promotion process? 2) How much time and effort do you put into the promotion process? 3) As you went through the promotion process, can you describe your integration into the academic community? The interviews should run approximately ninety minutes. In order to ensure the accuracy of the respondent's answers, the interviews will be tape-recorded. Each member of the research team will interview approximately fourteen faculty members.

Three of the team members will be responsible for transcribing the audiotapes to text. Two of the team members will be responsible for independently coding these transcriptions. A protocol will be established to ensure inter-rater reliability. The coding will consist of extracting statements aiming at the "essence" of the faculty member's experiences, values, and perceptions. We will look for salient descriptions of the organizational culture, socialization processes, and/or descriptions of whether their individual characteristics fit within these two concepts. Once transcription and coding is complete, three team members will analyze the results of the coding. For analysis of the interviews, we will be determining the extent to which faculty members' experiences, perceptions and/or values are consistent with the schema of Weber and/or Martin. We are also interested in the effects of socialization tactics and individual characteristics of the

faculty members on the promotion process. In our study, we hope to also be able to compare how these factors are different across disciplines. We expect to find that the department with less gender representation will more closely follow Weber's schema while the department with greater gender representation will more closely follow Martin and Knopoff's schema.

Vitae

We will request a current vitae from each faculty member to assess individual characteristics such as training, publication productivity, and other demographic information.

## Conclusion

This study will expand our understanding of the promotion process focusing on promotion to full professor, an area of research lacking thorough investigation. The lived experiences as described by the individuals who have undergone the promotion process will inform the research by identifying gaps in previous studies. The findings of our study will have practical implications as well. We are confident that the findings of this research will inform knowledge concerning the promotion process and the equity of the criteria used in making promotion decisions. By examining the interaction between the organizational culture and the individual characteristics, we can determine their effects on the promotion process and outcome. We believe that all the interested stakeholders, including administrators, faculty, and society will benefit from the findings of this research.

References

Acker, J. (1990). Hierarchies, Jobs, and Bodies: A Theory of Gendered Organizations. *Gender and Society, 4*(2).

Basinger, J. (1998, January, 23). Professors wins first-amendment lawsuit against Kutztown U. The Faculty. The Chronicle of Higher Education.

Bellas, M.L., & Toutkoushian, R.K. (1999). Faculty time allocations and research productivity: Gender, race and family effects. *The Review of Higher Education,* 22(4), 367-390.

Chronicle Almanac. (1999). The almanac of higher education: 1999-2000. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, Vol. XLVI(1).

*Chronicle of Higher Education*. (1994, November 23). St. Bonaventure president faulted for firing only males. Faculty Notes.

Garcia, R.L. (1979). Affirmative Action Hiring. *Journal of Higher Education,* 45, 268-276.

Long, J.S., Allison, P.D., & McGinnis, R. (1993). Rank advancement in academic careers: Sex differences and the effects of productivity. *American Sociological Review,* 58(5), 703-722.

Martin, J. & Knopoff, K. (1997). The gendered implications of apparently gender-neutral theory: Rereading Max Weber. In A. Larson & R. E. Freeman (Eds.), *Women's studies and business ethics: Toward a new conversation*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

McElrath, K. (1992). Gender, career disruption, and academic rewards. *Journal of Higher Education,* 63(3), 269-281.

Menges, R. J. & Exum, W. H. (1983). Barriers to the Progress of Women and Minority Faculty. *Journal of Higher Education, 54*(2), 123-144.

Rokeach, M. (1975). *Beliefs, Attitudes and Values: A Theory of Organizational Change*. (Fifth ed.). San Franciso: Jossey-Bass.

Pugh D. S. & Hickson, D. J. (1997). *Writers on organizations.* London: SAGE Publications.

Schein, E. H. (1971). The individual, the organization, and the career: A conceptual scheme. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science,* 7, 401-426.

Schneider, A. (1998). More professors are working part time, and more teach at 2-year colleges. *The Chronicle of Higher Education.*

Scott, W. R. (1998). *Organizations: Rational, natural, and open systems.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, Inc.

Taylor, F. W. (1916/1996). The principles of scientific management. In J. M. Shafritz & J. S. Ott (Eds.), *Classics of organization theory.* New York, NY: Harcourt Brace College Publishers.

Tierney, W. G. & Bensimon, E. M. (1996). *Promotion and Tenure: Community and Socialization in Academe.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

Van Maanen, J. & Schein, E. H. (1979). Toward a theory of organizational socialization. *Research in Organizational Behavior: An Annual Series of Analytical Essays and Critical Reviews.* Greenwich, Connecticut: JAI Press Inc.

Weber, M. (1946/1996). Bureaucracy. In J. M. Shafritz & J. S. Ott (Eds.), *Classics of organization theory.* New York, NY: Harcourt Brace College Publishers.

Whicker, M.L., Kronenfeld, J.J., & Strickland, R.A. (1993). *Getting Tenure.* Newbury Park, California: Sage Publications, Inc.

**BEST COPY AVAILABLE**